



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

outside of the prologue—an essay, by the way, which finds no mention in Réville's bibliography. Of course, this gospel is valueless in Réville's estimation as a source for the history of Jesus, and he makes practically no use of it. On questions of textual criticism the reader is referred to Gebhardt's revision of Tischendorf's text, and to Tischendorf's *Critica Major*, edition of 1859! One would pass this as a type error, did it not appear that, in at least one passage (Matt. 17:21), our author follows the seventh edition of Tischendorf where it differs from the eighth.

These volumes, the fruit of labors which have evidently been arduous, must be acknowledged to be disappointing. The criticism is too often trivial, the treatment of the sources too often arbitrary, the use of accepted data too often partial. The book has not the spiritual insight of Keim, nor the poetic charm of Renan. Undoubtedly earnest in purpose, it leaves the impression of a great tragedy, and not in the sense which M. Réville intends. If this representation is true, Jesus made wreck of his own life by proving false to his own high vision. The temple cleansing was his fall.

The book contains an excellent map and an index of subjects. An index of Scripture passages is lacking, and is missed.

NEWTON CENTER, MASS.

RUSH RHEES.

DE QUATUOR QUÆ IN NOVO TESTAMENTO DE CÆNA DOMINI EXTANT  
RELATIONUM NATURA AC INDOLE. CAROLUS GULIELMUS  
RUDOLPHUS SCHAEFER. Königsberg: 1896. Pp. 40, 8vo.

THE facts which this pamphlet attempts to meet, and which have been used by Jülicher, Spitta, and others, to discredit the ritual character and permanence of the Last Supper are these: (1) In Mark the words of Jesus, "This do in remembrance of me," which are the warrant for the perpetuation of the rite, are wanting. (2) Luke 22:19b, 20 is omitted by Westcott and Hort, on the authority of codex D principally. This means that, as you get back towards the probable primitive account, authority for the rite tends to disappear, and finally you are left with a totally denuded account.

Against this the writer urges (1) the fact of the perpetuation of the rite from the very beginning, showing in what way the apostles, who are the authorities for whatever accounts we have, understood our Lord. (2) That all the accounts, including 1 Cor. 11:23-25, which is the most detailed, are derived from the Twelve, and that the difference of more

or less primitive among them is, therefore, delusive. (3) The connection of the Last Supper with the passover in Mark and the reference to the new covenant point to an intended parallel between the two rites, and the perpetuation of the one as of the other. (4) That Jesus' words must have been intelligible, and that, therefore, the sense in which they were universally taken is right. (5) That Luke, 1:1-4, professed to follow tradition, whereas the omission of 22:19<sup>b</sup>, 20 would make him impugn tradition, and that these verses are demanded by the context.

Evidently, the question between the longer and the shorter form of Luke is the most important question raised. Probably Westcott and Hort were right in omitting the verses from their point of view. But since then, the brilliant and probable suggestion that the peculiar readings of codex D were taken from the Logia removes the necessity for supposing that the shortened form is original in Luke, but leaves the question in a still more interesting shape. It becomes now a question between the two synoptical sources, between Mark and the Logia. But the strong point in the argument against this critical doubt is the fact of the celebration from the beginning, showing in what sense our Lord's words were taken by the apostles. It is undeniably strong. But the assumption that Jesus' words are to be taken in the sense attached to them by the early disciples does not always hold good. One of the proofs of the historicity of the gospels is that they have reported the words of Jesus, even where they tell against themselves, and their report has been decisive against their interpretation.

But, after all, the main question in regard to the place of the memorial rite in the worship of the church is answered by its own fitness and beauty.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL,  
Philadelphia, Pa.

DAS KINDHEITSEVANGELIUM NACH LUCAS UND MATTHAEUS, unter Herbeiziehung der ausserkanonischen Paralleltexthe quellenkritisch untersucht. Von ALFRED RESCH. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897. Pp. iv + 335. M. 6.50.

THIS is the fifth part of the author's collection of extra-canonical parallel texts to the gospels which he has published since 1893. It treats of the gospel of the infancy, which he regards as being in close connection with John's prologue. From the preface we learn that thirty-three years ago the author entered upon his duties as evangelical